

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 43, 58, 116-121, 204, 206-209, 211-213, 223-232 and 235-238 were previously pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 43 and 235-237 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 58, 116-121, 204, 206-209, 211-213 and 223-232 have been amended. New claims 239-252 have been added. Applicant notes that the new claims are the same as claims 117-120, 204, 207, 209, 211-213, 223-225 and 228 as previously pending but written in independent form. Support for the claim amendments and newly added claims can be found throughout the instant specification and in the claims as filed. As a result, claims 58, 116-121, 204, 206-209, 211-213, 223-232 and 238-252 are pending for examination with claims 58, 232 and 239-252 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Election/Restriction

The Examiner has alleged that claims 232, 237 and 238 would have fallen in non-elected Group I of the Restriction Requirement mailed on December 29, 2005.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, elected Group II includes methods of using the compositions of claims 43, 58, 116-121 and 204-214. Applicant believes that claims 232, 237 and 238 are directed to such methods and, thus, are included within the elected restriction group. Further, Applicant notes that the Examiner examined at least the method of claim 232 in the previous office action and even included this claim in one of the prior rejections.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 58, 117-120, 204, 207, 209, 211-213, 223-225 and 228 as allegedly being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for indicating that the aforementioned claims would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicant believes that the claim amendments made herein and described further below render the claim objections moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 235 and 236 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses. However, without conceding the correctness of the Examiner's rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant has canceled claims 235 and 236. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is now moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 43, 116, 121, 204, 206, 208, 226, 227, 229-231 and 235 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,527,532 to Edelman et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses. However, without conceding the correctness of the Examiner's rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant has amended or canceled the rejected claims such that it is believed that this rejection is rendered moot.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,



Janice A. Vatland, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 52,318

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000

Date: December 3, 2007

x12.01.07